Meeting Minutes Valley Asphalt Site, Moraine, Ohio (South Dayton Dump & Landfill)

Meeting Date:	May 9, 2013	Meeting Time:	3:00 pm – 3:40 pm
Attendees:	 ☐ Arp, Jeff (BMI) ☐ Crago, Dan (Valley) ☐ Patterson, Leslie (US) ☐ Guest: Marshall, Lau ☐ Guest: Heck, Kelly (\text{Valley}) 	Laura (OEPA, SWDO)	
Facilitator:	⊠ Katherine Beach, Bowser Morner, Inc. (BMI)		

Discussions

- 1. Work Plan
 - a. Work Plan comments by USEPA received by Valley
 - b. Extension for submittal of complete Work Plan ap proved for May 15, 2013.
 - c. Work Plan should address the following issues:
 - i. In lieu of Access Agreement, include language in dicating USEPA and its representatives are authorized to access the Site.
 - ii. Include IA and SS sampling during Performance S ampling.
 - iii. Provide detail in Performance Sampling section (§4.4).
 - iv. Clearly define "intrinsically safe" in the Miti gation Plan (§4.0).
 - v. Detail each proposed mitigation system and probe locations (§4.0 and Appendix x).
 - vi. Include item in Project Schedule (§7.0) for dem olition activities (within x days).
- 2. Mitigation Database Summary Review
 - a. Demolition tentatively planned for 3 or 4 struct ures:
 - i. Building 1
 - ii. Building 2 (recent inspection indicates demolit ion of front (office) portion of the building may be difficult, costly or impractical, as its shared wall with the back (Quonset Hut) portion is structurally connected; Valley re-assessing options)
 - iii. Building 7 (ownership of building verified to be Jack Boesch, who has given verbal authorization to demolish it)
 - iv. Building MP

- b. Steve indicated that demolition of building(s) d own to the slab mitigates his (removal action) concerns and that no further action regarding the slabs is necessary.
- c. Demolition schedule is dependant on asbestos and lead surveys, which will be performed next Monday and Tuesday.
- d. Leslie verified that since the ultimate remedy f or the site is a cap, leaving the slabs in place (after demolition) is acceptable.
- e. Mitigation is planned for 2 or 3 structures:
 - i. Building 2 (the back portion, the Quonset Hut, t entatively will be mitigated, pending Valley's assessment mentioned above
 - ii. Building 4
 - iii. Building 5
- f. Steve inquired whether Valley was still consider ing the installation of intrinsically safe mitigation systems in all buildings, to anticipate and prepare for possible, future appearance of methane in buildings where methane is not currently an issue. Dan replied that Valley is still considering this option.
- g. The area within Building 2 covers approximately 4,000 square feet. Guidance suggests that a single system typically can mitigate up to 1500 square foot. Steve suggested that a single fan may be able to be used for greater coverage if a manifold system was utilized.
- h. Building 6 was confirmed to be slab-on-grade; it does not have an earthen floor. This building is used for storage, is not inhabited and has constant ventilation via permanent screens in the building's two doors. No data is available to suggest that sub-slab or indoor air monitoring has taken place. Steve recommended that sub-slab sampling take place; the data generated will drive the removal decision.
- i. Steve requested that a photograph of Building 7 be distributed.

3. Other-

a. In the comments received last week, it was noted that CRA would cease performing the weekly methane monitoring in Building 2. Valley has volunteered to perform the methane monitoring in Building 2 if necessary; Katherine is to contact CRA contact Adam Loney to discuss this issue.

Action Items

- 1. Valley to submit Work Plan to USEPA. Due 5/15/1 3.
- 2. Beach to invite Laura Marshall to teleconference s. Due 5/10/13.

Thank you for attending and being prepared. Please let me know if these minutes contain inaccuracies or misstatements.